U.S. COMMISSION ON CIVIL RIGHTS

+ + + + +

TELEPHONIC BUSINESS MEETING

+ + + + +

FRIDAY, OCTOBER 18, 2019

+ + + + +

The Commission convened via teleconference at 10:00 a.m., Catherine Lhamon, Chair, presiding.

PRESENT:

CATHERINE E. LHAMON, Chair

PATRICIA TIMMONS-GOODSON, Vice Chair

DEBO P. ADEGBILE, Commissioner

GAIL HERIOT, Commissioner

PETER N. KIRSANOW, Commissioner

DAVID KLADNEY, Commissioner

KAREN K. NARASAKI, Commissioner

MICHAEL YAKI, Commissioner

MAURO MORALES, Staff Director

MAUREEN RUDOLPH, General Counsel

STAFF PRESENT:

NICHOLAS BAIR

KATHERINE CULLITON-GONZALES

PAMELA DUNSTON, Chief, ASCD

ALFREDA GREENE

WARREN ORR

JUANDA SMITH

BRIAN WALCH

MARIK XAVIER-BRIER, PhD.

COMMISSIONER ASSISTANTS PRESENT:

ALEC DUELL

CARISSA MULDER

AMY ROYCE

RUKKU SINGLA

PEACH SOLTIS

ALISON SOMIN

IRENA VIDULOVIC

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.APPROVAL OF AGENDA
II.BUSINESS MEETING
A. Presentation by Maine Advisory Committee Member on the Committee's Recent Report, The Criminalization of People with Mental Illnesses in Maine
B. Presentation by Georgia Advisory Committee Member on the Committee's Recent Report, Disability Rights and Civil Rights in Georgia 1
C. Presentation by Nevada Advisory Committee Member on the Committee's Recent Report, Mental Health Implications for Policing Practices and the Administration of Justice in Nevada
D. Discussion and Vote on Commission's Report, Report, Sexual Harassment and Free Speech on Campus
E. Consideration of a Commission Public Comment on the Department of Housing and Urban Development's Proposed Rule Regarding the Disparate Impact Standard under the Fair Housing Act
F. Management and Operations - Staff Director's Report
TIT.ADJOURN MEETING

1 PROCEEDINGS 2 (10:01 a.m.)3 CHAIR LHAMON: This meeting of the U.S. 4 Commission on Civil Rights comes to order at 10:01 5 a.m. Eastern Time on October 18th, 2019. The 6 meeting takes place over the phone. 7 I'm Chair Catherine Lhamon. I'd like 8 to confirm each of the commissioners is on the 9 line, so I'll take a roll call here. 10 present when I say your name. 11 Vice Chair Timmons-Goodson. 12 (No audible response.) 13 CHAIR LHAMON: Commissioner Adegbile. 14 COMMISSIONER ADEGBILE: Present. 15 CHAIR LHAMON: Commissioner Heriot. 16 COMMISSIONER HERIOT: I'm here. 17 CHAIR LHAMON: Commissioner Kirsanow. 18 COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: Here. 19 CHAIR LHAMON: Commissioner Kladney. 20 COMMISSIONER KLADNEY: Here. 21 CHAIR LHAMON: Commissioner Narasaki. 22 COMMISSIONER NARASAKI: Here. 23 CHAIR LHAMON: Commissioner Yaki.

COMMISSIONER YAKI: Present.

Thank you.

CHAIR LHAMON:

24

25

Based on

1	that, a quorum of the commissioners is present. Is
2	the court reporter present?
3	COURT REPORTER: Yes, I'm here.
4	CHAIR LHAMON: Thank you. Is the staff
5	director present?
6	STAFF DIRECTOR MORALES: I am.
7	CHAIR LHAMON: Thank you. The meeting
8	shall now come to order.
9	I. APPROVAL OF AGENDA
10	CHAIR LHAMON: Is there a motion to
11	approve the agenda for this business meeting?
12	COMMISSIONER NARASAKI: Commissioner
13	Narasaki. I move to approve the agenda.
14	COMMISSIONER ADEGBILE: Commissioner
15	Adegbile. Second.
16	CHAIR LHAMON: I'll begin the call for
17	amendments with a couple of my own. First, I'd
18	like to table the vote on the Maryland and West
19	Virginia State Advisory Committee slates until our
20	next business meeting. Second, I would like to add
21	consideration of the public comments on HUD's
22	proposed rule on the disparate impact standard
23	under the Fair Housing Act.
24	Do I have a second for my amendment?
25	COMMISSIONER KLADNEY: I second.

1	Kladney.
2	CHAIR LHAMON: Thank you. Is there any
3	further amendments? Hearing none, let's go to
4	approve the agenda as amended. All those in favor,
5	say aye.
6	(Chorus of aye.)
7	CHAIR LHAMON: Any opposed?
8	(No audible response.)
9	CHAIR LHAMON: Any abstentions?
10	(No audible response.)
11	CHAIR LHAMON: The motion passes
12	unanimously.
13	II. BUSINESS MEETING
14	PRESENTATION BY MAINE ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEMBER
14 15	PRESENTATION BY MAINE ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEMBER ON THE COMMITTEE'S RECENT REPORT,
15	ON THE COMMITTEE'S RECENT REPORT,
15 16	ON THE COMMITTEE'S RECENT REPORT, THE CRIMINALIZATION OF PEOPLE WITH MENTAL
15 16 17	ON THE COMMITTEE'S RECENT REPORT, THE CRIMINALIZATION OF PEOPLE WITH MENTAL ILLNESSES IN MAINE
15 16 17 18	ON THE COMMITTEE'S RECENT REPORT, THE CRIMINALIZATION OF PEOPLE WITH MENTAL ILLNESSES IN MAINE CHAIR LHAMON: The first item on the
15 16 17 18 19	ON THE COMMITTEE'S RECENT REPORT, THE CRIMINALIZATION OF PEOPLE WITH MENTAL ILLNESSES IN MAINE CHAIR LHAMON: The first item on the agenda is to hear from Eric Mehnert of the
15 16 17 18 19 20	ON THE COMMITTEE'S RECENT REPORT, THE CRIMINALIZATION OF PEOPLE WITH MENTAL ILLNESSES IN MAINE CHAIR LHAMON: The first item on the agenda is to hear from Eric Mehnert of the Commission's Maine Advisory Committee on the
15 16 17 18 19 20 21	ON THE COMMITTEE'S RECENT REPORT, THE CRIMINALIZATION OF PEOPLE WITH MENTAL ILLNESSES IN MAINE CHAIR LHAMON: The first item on the agenda is to hear from Eric Mehnert of the Commission's Maine Advisory Committee on the Committee's most recent report titled

very much look forward to hearing his contribution.

1	Mr. Mehnert, go ahead. Is Mr. Mehnert
2	on the line? Okay. We'll pause and hope that
3	he'll join us later, and we'll turn to the
4	MR. MEHNERT: I am here.
5	CHAIR LHAMON: Oh, terrific. Mr.
6	Mehnert, go ahead.
7	MR. MEHNERT: Okay. Did they get me
8	through?
9	CHAIR LHAMON: Yes, go ahead.
10	MR. MEHNERT: Okay. Good morning,
11	Chair Lhamon and Commissioners. My name is Eric
12	Mehnert, and I am Chief Judge of the Penobscot
13	Nation, and I serve on the Maine Advisory
14	Committee.
15	The Maine Advisory Committee had a
16	public hearing, and it produced a report seeking
17	decriminalization of mental illness in Maine.
18	Before I begin, it is important to acknowledge the
19	work of all those who made the report possible.
20	That starts with Deputy De La Viez, who works
21	tirelessly in the Eastern Regional Office, and he
22	played a major role in putting this report
23	together.
24	It is also important to acknowledge the
25	work that Evelyn Bohor of the Commission and the

contract attorney Julie Bush and their efforts in distilling the information received at the public hearing and offering indispensable support putting the report together.

also acknowledge We want to the Diane Khiel, for Advisory Committee's Chair, all leadership and effort to keeping us moving forward and on task. We'd be remiss if we did not offer appreciation civil our to the rights advocates, law enforcement agencies, jails, attorneys, legislators, family members, and members the public who gave freely of their time into a conversation and discourse attempt to solve the significant problem in Maine's criminal justice system.

The 1960s saw the inception of to de-institutionalize those suffering movement from mental health challenges. In Maine, movement led to a class action suit against the hospitals 1980s state mental in the and, eventually, to the appointment of a Special Master. The Special Master in Maine currently is a former chief justice of the State's Supreme Court. The institutions remain under the purview the Special Master.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

Unfortunately, while the deinstitutionalization movement sought the commendable goals of providing community services and supports so that individuals with mental health challenges might live at home, the money never followed the policy. So while government saving money by no longer funding mental health institutions, it was failing to fund community services and supports that were so essential to those with mental health challenges. That failure led directly to a rise in the homelessness of those challenged with mental health issues and concurrent rise in the criminalization of the mentally ill. The criminalization occurs when an individual suffering from mental health challenges not have the supports they need community. Community members see behaviors that they consider abhorrent or problematic, and they contact law enforcement.

Properly trained law enforcement officers are skilled in recognizing an individual with a mental health challenge, and they're skilled in de-escalation. Unfortunately, that is only a fraction of the law enforcement in the state. The former sheriff in Aroostook County advised that,

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

while 70 percent of his officers had received crisis intervention training, none in any of the ten municipal law enforcement departments in Aroostook County had received similar training.

The Maine Criminal Justice Academy has passed a policy providing that 25 percent of the full-time law enforcement officers will receive eight hours of training by January of 2018. We haven't confirmed at this point in time whether that has, in fact, occurred. But the fact of the matter is that eight hours is not enough. Having participated in one of those trainings, it is also clear that those trainings need to be presented by an independent body.

The failure of trainings and having a completely trained law enforcement officers with respect to mental health challenges has led to a disproportionate number of individuals with mental health challenges being arrested on petty crimes. them We've arrested on crimes seen such disorderly conduct, loitering, or public And as a result, 64 percent of the individuals in their jails have a mental health diagnosis.

For juveniles in Maine, the rate is astronomically higher. It's about 85 percent of

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

those at a juvenile detention facility have three or more mental health diagnoses when they came into the facility.

statistics saw individuals with mental health diagnosis will remain in the times longer on misdemeanor charges those without mental health issues, and the increased financial burden on the jails and county jails is exponentially greater for those who come into the jails with mental health issues.

The cost in human life is even greater.

In 2011, Maine State Police shot nine people in police confrontations. Five of those individuals had mental health issues. All five were killed.

But there is some hope. At this point in time, many law enforcement officers or agencies doing what they can. The county sheriffs particularly seem to recognize the problem because front lines. Police are on the Sauschuck who came up with a co-responder program, which was a leading program in ensuring that, when an individual has a mental health challenge and the called, health police were that а mental professional or а crisis worker went with police to respond. Police Chief Sauschuck is now

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

1 the Commissioner in the Department of the Public 2 Finally, there is Representative Talbert Health. Ross who continues to work tirelessly within the 3 4 state legislature on criminal justice reform. 5 advisory group has The come to the conclusion and believes that it is essential that 6 7 evidence-based programs and policies detect 8 treat individuals who have mental health challenges 9 and who are caught up in the criminal justice 10 system -- excuse me. That there be evidence-based 11 programs policies to protect treat and and 12 individuals the criminal caught up in 13 system. 14 It also believes that it is essential 15 that the government fully fund community 16 consistent with evidence-based best systems 17 practices to prevent individuals with mental health 18 challenges from entering the system. 19 That is essentially the report from the 20 State of Maine and the Maine Advisory Committee. 21 am open to any questions. 22 CHAIR LHAMON: Thank you so much. 23 open it for questions from my fellow commissioners. 24 COMMISSIONER NARASAKI: Good morning, 25 Madam Chair. Commissioner Narasaki would like to

1 ask a question. 2 CHAIR LHAMON: Go ahead. 3 COMMISSIONER NARASAKI: Thank you 4 much for this incredibly comprehensive report. Ιt 5 five is issue that, in mу years the 6 Commission, I've come to realize it's close 7 almost all of the issues that we have been working 8 on, including the school-to-prison pipeline. So it 9 particularly important to 10 recommendations around the issue of actually 11 providing mental healthcare. 12 I've talked to many police who 13 told me that they want to be able to refer people 14 are clearly having a mental health crisis 15 somewhere, but there's nowhere to take them. So that 16 is clearly a problem that needs be 17 addressed. 18 had recommended that You the state 19 legislature pass legislation that provides student 20 loan debt relief for mental health professionals to 21 try to get them to the more rural parts of Maine. 22 Is that based on seeing other programs like that, 23 or is that a new idea?

based on the similar programs of the same nature.

MR. MEHNERT:

24

25

My understanding is it's

significant issue with Maine has а educators, providers, and even attorneys who could provide support for those who are in the throes of a mental health crisis in rural Maine. We have one county are three attorneys in the entire where there In another county, there are supposedly five district attorneys, one district attorney and four assistant district attorneys. All four ADA slots are open.

What that causes for a challenge for us is that individuals who are being taken to the jail as a place of last resort are simply not getting processed, and they're languishing in the jail. so the desire to have some kind of And loan forgiveness program have been not only, it strikes to not only be for providers, although that would be the number one, crisis workers, would absolutely be essential, but also other mental providers, well health as as educators attorneys, would be a step in the right direction to ensuring that individuals who are essentially disenfranchised are represented in the systems.

COMMISSIONER NARASAKI: That's great.

And the second question I have is one of your recommendations goes to the need to study and

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

recalculate the MaineCare reimbursement rates for community programs to reflect the actual costs. Is that, is there a funding issue there, as well as the need to recalculate the rates?

MR. MEHNERT: If you're talking about funding to the state government -- are you talking about the funding to the state government or the funding for the providers in the communities?

COMMISSIONER NARASAKI: Actually, both.

MR. MEHNERT: The funding for providers -- okay. I would say I would not be able to speak definitively to the first, although my impression is absolutely that what we're seeing with regards to the care for individuals in the community is that there is not enough money coming into state and, second, that a provider, we're having providers leave our rural areas because they simply cannot afford to live. And this ties closely to talking about with what you were the forgiveness, that it's really a two-pronged problem individuals that are working in the They have an incredible student loan debt that they have to deal with, and then they're not really being paid enough not only not to cover the student loan debt but to live. That is a real

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

challenge.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

So the providers need to be paid more and there needs to be more money in the state on the whole in recognition of some of the challenges that individuals with mental health challenges have.

COMMISSIONER NARASAKI: Great. Thank you so much. Madam Chair, I'm turning it back to you.

CHAIR LHAMON: Thank you. And I was talking on mute, so thank you for saying that. to say again that I had the pleasure joining this committee for the briefing, and I was by the public blown away comments that the committee received, the emotional testimony about challenges families of persons with mental illness experience in Maine and also by the leadership from many members of the law enforcement community in trying to improve their own practices and ensure that they respond against what described as a significant challenge, therapeutic availability absence of care for persons with mental illness in Maine.

I appreciated reading in this report the hopeful note about some improvements in that

arena in the state this year, so I look forward, imagine the Committee does as well, to seeing improvements in that area. And I just want commend and thank the Committee for its care information from receiving variety of а perspectives on the topic and in generating report that includes thorough really comprehensively recommendations and also distills a difficult topic into assessable findings. you very much.

Are there other questions or comments from other commissioners?

MR. MEHNERT: If I might add just one more thing. I think one of the things, Chair, that you talked about was the law enforcement that I thought was really salient that the law enforcement had said was that they are the only system that cannot say no, and that's a terrible way for us to be dealing with providers. We are defaulting to the only system that can't say no, and their response is to lock the individual up. And they don't want to do it. They don't have the services for it.

CHAIR LHAMON: I also found incredibly compelling the testimony from law enforcement about

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

1 the safety risk to law enforcement of failing 2 offer therapeutic care in the state, and I think 3 that's a point that's worth underscoring, as well. 4 Mr. Mehnert, thank you very much for 5 presentation and for your service and your leadership on the Maine Advisory Committee and for 6 7 taking the time to speak with us today. 8 MR. MEHNERT: Thank you. 9 PRESENTATION BY GEORGIA ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEMBER 10 ON THE COMMITTEE'S RECENT REPORT, 11 DISABILITY RIGHTS AND CIVIL RIGHTS IN GEORGIA 12 We'll now turn to our CHAIR LHAMON: 13 Georgia Advisory Committee and hear from Chanel 14 Haley from the Georgia Advisory Committee on that 15 committee's most recent report titled Disability 16 Rights and Civil Rights in Georgia. 17 Ms. Haley. 18 Good morning, Commission. MS. HALEY: 19 is Chanel Haley. My profession is 20 Gender Policy Manager at Georgia Equality, and I 21 serve as the secretary for the Georgia Advisory 22 Committee to the United States Commission on Civil 23 I also helped to actually chair this Rights. 24 particular report, co-chair this particular report,

and we had a lot of people that helped out with

this. We want to give a special notation to the person who brought this to us, our fellow member who actually passed away during the creation of this report, which was Justin Priestly. And if it wasn't for him, this would never have been on our radar.

But this is really about the Olmstead settlement, if or if Georgia not they were compliant, and a little background about the 1995 Olmstead lawsuit brought by George and Lois Curtis and then later on Elaine Wilson signed on. The lead attorney was Sue Jameson from Atlanta Legal Aid and, you know, the Supreme Court ruled that this was ADA integration by public agencies to for individuals in provide services need with disabilities.

And fast-forward to t.hen 109 SO we Georgia found to not have been where was in compliance and requested to do a settlement, they had subsequent years in order to become compliant. In February of 2018, on February 27th, hearing with the had а community, with government officials, with people from the state, that were able to testify on whether or not the compliance had been met.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

So the state said that they had
definitely met and succeeded all that was required
for the settlement. They had even boasted they had
spent over \$256 million in order to create a whole
new crisis system. However, the community seems to
feel very differently about this through the
testimony that was given. Some of the issues tha
they said that was not addressed or where the
problem areas was the community, first of all, di
not have any insights on reading the plan; tha
their education information about the community
services were not being given to people who
qualified for the services; the wait list i
extremely too long. Currently, at that time, i
was over 6,000 people still waiting to even be
approved to receive services. Testimony by the
community was not fully funded, contrary to the
state claims. So the state has claimed that the
spent over \$200 million on this, but when people
were asking to receive the funds for community
services they were told that there is no fund
there. There also were not any funds there to pa
for case management to be able to do the services.

Insurance companies are not providing the same payouts in reference to behavioral care as

they would if the person was using insurance for other disabilities.

There has been little to no oversight of nursing homes. Many nursing homes are in the same conditions as pre-Olmstead. That has been observed by several attorneys and watchdog organizations.

Supportive housing is usually clustered in a segregated area, and the community feels that it should be more mandated to be more spread out. Employment services for people living with disabilities has been а problem because hasn't been any, so people want to become more self-sufficient, which is really what the Olmstead was supposed to be about anyway.

The language barriers. You know, in Georgia, if English is not your first language, then you're kind of treated as a second-class citizen. And that also is something that has been implemented within the Olmstead is that, if a person's first language is not English, then they are not getting an education about the services through Olmstead and that they are just not being allowed to be part of the community services.

And, finally, Georgia, we believe, is

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

still the only state in the country that still does GNETS. And so what that is is Georgia Network for Educational and Therapeutic Support schools, and this is when kids are sent away to a special school who have behavioral health conditions, and the community was very clear that that was still a discriminatory practice.

So looking forward, you know, Georgia, actually, the settlement, they asked for extension. That was supposed to end in actually June 30 of 2018. Obviously, this is a few months after our hearing. Right now, they waiting to find out what the last independent review is, and that should be coming up, you know, any day now because that actually happened in the fall of 2018. So once that then comes out, we'll have a better understanding of where the money went and if the independent review actually finds out or thinks that if Georgia is actually in compliance.

relation Also, in to our recommendations of what think should we be happening in the future is that we would like it if there was a national study around Olmstead and to making sure if the changes in state disability law are being followed, particularly especially with

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

1	nursing homes because we feel as if nursing homes
2	is the one that people have really dropped the ball
3	on, considering since I said that there's
4	independent reviewers who think that the pre-
5	Olmstead conditions have not changed at all when it
6	comes to nursing homes.
7	We also would like to see that there
8	should be a working study committee around housing
9	to ensure and make sure that the safe and equal
10	housing practices are being implemented. And there
11	was also an issue around how the money was spent
12	and making sure that there was not just cost
13	savings but that there was smart choices made
14	around the money that is being reported when it
15	comes to implementing all of that.
16	That is a very, very, very brief
17	summary. If there are any questions, I would be
18	willing to take them now.
19	CHAIR LHAMON: Thank you so much, Ms.
20	Haley. I'll open for questions from fellow
21	commissioners.
22	COMMISSIONER NARASAKI: Madam Chair,
23	this is Commissioner Narasaki.
24	CHAIR LHAMON: All right, Commissioner.
25	COMMISSIONER NARASAKI: Thank you.

you.

This is an incredibly important report, particularly as we have more people aging and requiring these kinds of services. So I very much appreciate the work of the committee.

I noticed in the recommendations you talked about the issue in terms of the language and the lack of adequate access to translators for limited English-proficient people living in Georgia. Do you see the state taking any steps to try to enforce that? Is it the lack of knowledge about the requirement or lack of will, or what did you find was the issue in terms of that problem?

MS. HALEY: So we did not find during the hearings the cause of that. I certainly can say, as a person that used to work in the Georgia House of Representatives and was there when we actually just recently passed a law about what our first language is for the State of Georgia, that the tone is will, not knowledge because that is what's been had in the last five years around legislation here in Georgia.

I think that it would be great if the U.S. Commission would send a letter to our governor letting them know of where they were lacking in meeting the needs of the requirement. So I think

1 that it's something that, if it was pointed out to 2 them, to our governor and our attorney general, 3 then they would become in compliance with it or 4 make an effort to at the very least. 5 COMMISSIONER NARASAKI: Do most nursing facilities, do they receive any federal funding? 6 7 Because under Title VI there's the federal guidance 8 requires people to address this that issue. 9 it's national origins discrimination. Otherwise, 10 I'm wondering if there's federal money that 11 would then require the feds to step in. 12 MS. HALEY: That's a question, I'm not 13 aware of that answer. I do not know the answer to 14 that question if they receive federal money, but 15 what we do know is that there isn't an oversight 16 there anyway so it would take a complaint for the 17 federal government to even know that a violation is 18 being made. 19 COMMISSIONER NARASAKI: Great. 20 you very much. I appreciate it. I turn it back to 21 you, Madam Chair. 22 Thank you. CHAIR LHAMON: Ms. Haley, I 23 report devastating and found your the topic, 24 obviously, is incredibly compelling. But to read

in the report about people who are in jail having

to wait weeks to have access to a bed that could
open up at Georgia Regional Hospital, so they are
spending more time incarcerated than would be
warranted by the alleged criminality, that
information about the nursing homes not making any
change in the state that brought the Olmstead
litigation, and the very deep concern about housing
choice voucher programs, the federal program not
providing sufficient higher rates for people to be
able to find living situations that are independent
and sustainable, all of which I found deeply
distressing and I appreciate your and your
committee shining a light on. So I want to say
thank you.
Other questions or comments from other
commissioners? Hearing none, I will thank you
again for your time and your leadership on the
Georgia Advisory Committee and for taking your time
to speak with us today.
PRESENTATION BY NEVADA ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEMBER ON
THE COMMITTEE'S RECENT REPORT,
MENTAL HEALTH IMPLICATIONS FOR POLICING PRACTICES
AND THE ADMINISTRATION OF JUSTICE IN
NEVADA
CHAIR LHAMON: We will turn next to

Sondra Cosgrove of the Commission's Nevada Advisory

Committee on that committee's most recent report

titled Mental Health Implications for Policing

Practices and the Administration of Justice in

Nevada.

Ms. Cosgrove.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

DR. COSGROVE: Thank you. Good morning. My name is Dr. Sondra Cosgrove, and I'm a history professor and the co-chair of the Nevada Advisory Committee.

Our report documents similar findings and makes similar recommendations as Maine's report. The Nevada Advisory Committee to the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights engaged in a year-long study about policing practices impacting individuals with behavioral and mental needs, specifically in relation to communities of color and veterans.

After a jump in the number of incidents in Nevada between law enforcement officers and individuals with behavioral and mental health needs, our committee decided to investigate why these interactions were producing such poor outcomes. When we heard testimony that communities of color and veterans were overrepresented in those

incidents, we explicitly included both populations in our investigation.

Based hearings, the Nevada on two Advisory Committee was alarmed over the amount of testimony we heard that revealed how often persons with unmet behavioral and mental health needs are interacting with law enforcement officers due to a lack of available services, as well as high number of currently incarcerated Nevadans who are being treated for mental or behavioral The numbers disorders. high that are SO we consider this issue to be a crisis.

We repeatedly heard testimony about how Nevada's severe shortage of behavioral and mental health providers and services is directly leading to civil rights violations in our prison system, which has caused our prison system to become the largest provider of mental health services, with the women's prison treating close to 60 percent of their inmates for some type of mental health need.

The Advisory Committee, therefore, has concluded in our report that Nevada must prioritize addressing mental and behavioral health treatment shortages if we hope to address other pressing issues related to criminal justice, education, and

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

healthcare reform. We understand that our shortage 1 2 of providers and services is longstanding and will 3 require investments in multiple areas, such as de-4 escalation training for law enforcement, workforce 5 development through our higher education system, and higher Medicaid reimbursement rates. 6 7 But, ethically, we must strongly 8 do everything recommend Nevada it and can as 9 possible quickly as to address the 10 disproportionately high number of incidents 11 produce poor outcomes between law enforcement and 12 individuals who need mental health treatment, not 13 incarceration. 14 Thank you. I'm open for questions. 15 CHAIR LHAMON: Thank you so much, 16 I'll open for questions from my fellow Cosgrove. 17 commissioners. 18 COMMISSIONER KLADNEY: Madam Chair, 19 Dave Kladney here. I'd like to --20 CHAIR LHAMON: All right, Mr. Kladney. 21 COMMISSIONER KLADNEY: Thank you. 22 like thank Vice Chair Cosgrove to and Chair 23 Blaylock. find their findings Ι and 24 recommendations are comprehensive, they show a path

to safer policing for police, the public, and the

1 disabled. However, the Nevada legislature needs to 2 take note of these recommendations and find funding 3 mechanisms so they can be instituted. 4 Crisis intervention training and 5 escalation training are desperately needed. The legislature did pass a law in the last session 6 7 providing 12 hours of training but over 8 subjects which were not mandatory as to which ones 9 will be taught. 10 I'd like to thank Chair Blaylock again 11 and Vice Chair Cosgrove and the committee members 12 for their hard work. I attended both sessions, 13 open sessions, public sessions. And I'd also like 14 to thank our staff members, Alejandro Ventura and 15 Ana Fortes, for their work on this matter. I think 16 report is fairly comprehensive and actually 17 finds findings and recommendations more than has 18 been found just in Maine but even in our work here 19 in the National Commission. So thank you very 20 much. 21 And I turn it back to the Chair. 22 CHAIR LHAMON: Thank you. Other 23 questions or comments from other commissioners? 24 COMMISSIONER NARASAKI: This is

Commissioner Narasaki, Madam Chair.

CHAIR LHAMON: Go ahead, Commissioner Narasaki.

COMMISSIONER NARASAKI: So I also want to commend you on the report and, sadly, I'm leaving the Commission or I would be trying to convince my fellow commissioners to take up this issue of mental health as a next topic for this commission to consider because, clearly, it is becoming a crisis and flows through so many other issues.

I'm wondering, it seems to me like this issue where people across the aisle is across the police and sort of criminal justice activists divide could actually come together. Are is law enforcement in Nevada police in Nevada, organizing, is this topic а that they interested in trying to work with other advocates legislature move the state on? Because, to clearly, it's going to require more funding and some changes and approaches that will require state legislation.

DR. COSGROVE: Yes, this is Sondra Cosgrove. That's exactly what we found. When we were doing our hearing, oftentimes we would have sitting at the table law enforcement, advocates for

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

behavioral and mental health, and legislators and representatives of the criminal justice system, and it was very obvious to us that they're already having these discussions. In real life, if they don't all coordinate together, there's really no way to address this problem.

So we're already preparing for the next legislative session to make sure that we keep those coalitions together so that people see the totality of the problem and how many different agencies and different groups of people are coming to the table to work together. And one of the things that this has produced is we're now starting to realize that, when it comes to money, we're already spending a tremendous amount of money incarcerating people with mental illness and it would be actually less expensive if we invested in medical treatments and making sure that we have enough psychologists or we have enough social workers.

So we're looking at ways that we bridge funding from the very expensive and inefficient way and a that's producing way outcomes over into more reasonable, rational а system that recognizes behavioral and mental health as a medical condition so that we can use money

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

1	that's already in the system before we have to go
2	to the taxpayers and ask for more money.
3	COMMISSIONER NARASAKI: Well, I'm
4	definitely rooting for you to become an example to
5	the other states and also to Congress, so thank you
6	very much for you and your colleagues' work.
7	DR. COSGROVE: Thank you.
8	CHAIR LHAMON: Thank you. Are there
9	other questions
10	COMMISSIONER NARASAKI: And I'll turn
11	it back to the Chair.
12	CHAIR LHAMON: Thank you. Are there
13	other questions or comments from other
14	commissioners? Okay. Well, hearing none, we'll
15	turn to the next item on our agenda. Thank you,
16	Dr. Cosgrove, for your service
17	DR. COSGROVE: Thank you.
18	CHAIR LHAMON: on the Nevada Advisory
19	Committee. Thank you for taking the time to speak
20	with us today.
21	DR. COSGROVE: Thank you.
22	DISCUSSION AND VOTE ON COMMISSION'S REPORT, SEXUAL
23	HARASSMENT AND FREE SPEECH ON
24	CAMPUS
25	CHAIR LHAMON: We'll now to a

discussion and vote on the Commission's report titled Free to Learn: Speech and Sexual Harassment on Campus. We'll proceed with two votes, first on the report text and then with the findings and recommendations.

To open the floor up for discussion, I move to approve the report as circulated by my special assistants on Friday, October 11th. Is there a second?

COMMISSIONER NARASAKI: Commissioner Narasaki seconds.

CHAIR LHAMON: Thank you. I'll offer some points to begin our discussion. This project began before my tenure on the Commission. I will note it began while I was Assistant Secretary for Civil Rights at the Department of Education, and I was pleased to send my deputy to the Commission to testify about our work at the time and grateful to my Commission colleagues for their interest commitment to the issue of proper enforcement of Title IX. I thank our Office of General Counsel, including General Counsel Maureen Rudolph and Premier Attorney Advisory Lenore Ostrowsky, their research and drafting of the report text that we consider today.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

1	I'll open the floor for discussion for
2	additional amendments. Hearing none, I'll call the
3	question and take a roll call vote. Commissioner
4	Adegbile, how do you vote?
5	COMMISSIONER ADEGBILE: Aye.
6	CHAIR LHAMON: Commissioner Heriot.
7	COMMISSIONER HERIOT: I vote no. I was
8	the author of the concept paper for this report,
9	and the report has turned out nothing like the
10	concept report.
11	CHAIR LHAMON: Commissioner Kirsanow.
12	COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: No.
13	CHAIR LHAMON: Commissioner Kladney.
14	COMMISSIONER KLADNEY: Yes.
15	CHAIR LHAMON: Commissioner Narasaki.
16	COMMISSIONER NARASAKI: I vote yes.
17	CHAIR LHAMON: Commissioner Yaki.
18	COMMISSIONER YAKI: Aye.
19	CHAIR LHAMON: Vice Chair Timmons-
20	Goodson, who has joined us now.
21	VICE CHAIR TIMMONS-GOODSON: Yes.
22	CHAIR LHAMON: And I vote yes. The
23	motion passes. Two commissioners opposed, no
24	commissioner abstained, five of us were in favor.
25	Next, we'll consider findings and

recommendations for the report. To open the floor for discussion, I move to approve the findings and recommendations circulated by my special assistant on Friday, October 11th. Is there a second?

COMMISSIONER NARASAKI: This is Commissioner Narasaki. I second.

CHAIR LHAMON: Thank you. I'll open the floor for discussion, and I will just note, Commissioner Heriot, I am dismayed to hear that your view is that the report is not responsive to the concept paper or to the ideas that you hoped the Commission would investigate. I note that when I started, among the first drafts that I received, which was a few years ago, was the draft and that draft was subsequently broader in scope and I was prepared and delighted to review and edit that And, Commissioner Heriot, your request was topic. that the report be narrowed to its current scope, and I acceded to that, as I understand that this is Commission project that you asked the And I am pleased to investigate and that you led. have the Commission narrow its focus on the topic that you requested as the leader of the report. am surprised to hear and sorry that your view now is that the narrowed scope or the content of the

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

1 report is not as focused as you would have hoped. 2 Some may know that in the five years 3 the Commission held this version you have 4 plenty of time to lay those concerns and to seek to 5 have different text either in the report or modify 6 or alter the scope of the findings 7 recommendations. So I'll just say that I am sorry 8 that a topic that you asked the Commission to 9 investigate does not align with what 10 expectations were. I have been pleased to review 11 the expertise and analysis from General our 12 Counsel's office on the topic, and Ι think 13 substantially narrowed scope of the report, 14 nonetheless, makes an important contribution to 15 civil rights investigation, and I support it. 16 COMMISSIONER HERIOT: A lot of what you 17 Madam Chair. said broke up, I think you're a 18 little confused, but I will let the concept paper 19 speak for itself. 20 Okay. CHAIR LHAMON: Is there any 21 further discussion --22 COMMISSIONER NARASAKI: So, Madam 23 Chair, this is Commissioner Narasaki. I wanted to

thank the Chair and her special assistant,

their hard work on trying to finish the report.

24

25

Ιt

was the first hearing, my first hearing. I came in after, I think, in the middle of the first session because I had been appointed the night before and was trying to get sworn in before the hearing was done. So I'm glad this is being completed before I leave the Commission.

I think that the passage of time has, in fact, made it very challenging because many of the issues that were raised, some of the issues that were raised have been altered by the passage of time and changes in policy and changes in administration. I actually had suggested that we just issue the transcript rather than try to do a report given that fact. It remains an incredibly important issue, as the recently published reports on the state of harassment on campuses and the high rates that particularly women students are facing terms of assaults and harassment and in other inappropriate actions happening that hurt ability to learn and undermine the overall learning on these campuses.

So I'm glad that we're finally issuing it and appreciate your efforts to try to put it together, given all the challenges.

CHAIR LHAMON: Thank you, Commissioner

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

1	Narasaki. Is there any other discussion? Hearing
2	none, I'll call the question and take the roll call
3	vote. Commissioner Adegbile, how do you vote?
4	COMMISSIONER ADEGBILE: Aye.
5	CHAIR LHAMON: Commissioner Heriot.
6	COMMISSIONER HERIOT: I vote no. These
7	findings and recommendations read like an apology
8	for the Department of Education.
9	CHAIR LHAMON: Commissioner Kirsanow.
10	COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: No.
11	CHAIR LHAMON: Commissioner Kladney.
12	COMMISSIONER KLADNEY: Yes.
13	CHAIR LHAMON: Commissioner Narasaki.
14	COMMISSIONER NARASAKI: Yes.
15	CHAIR LHAMON: Commissioner Yaki.
16	COMMISSIONER YAKI: Aye.
17	CHAIR LHAMON: Vice Chair Timmons-
18	Goodson.
19	VICE CHAIR TIMMONS-GOODSON: Yes.
20	CHAIR LHAMON: And I vote yes. The
21	motion passes. Two commissioners opposed, no
22	commissioner abstained, and all others were in
23	favor. As a point of personal privilege, I will
24	note for the record that I am probably the last
25	person on the planet who would apologize for the

Department of Education.

I'll note that with the adoption of the report and the findings and recommendations, the clock begins ticking with respect to the deadlines for statements and rebuttals. Statements will be due on Monday, November 18 with rebuttals due on Wednesday, December 18. Commissioners must file notice of their intention to file a surrebuttal by Thursday, December 26th and then must file the text of their surrebuttal on Thursday, January 2.

CONSIDERATION OF A COMMISSION PUBLIC COMMENT ON

DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT'S

PROPOSED RULE REGARDING THE DISPARATE IMPACT

STANDARD UNDER THE FAIR HOUSING ACT

CHAIR LHAMON: Next, we will move to the amended item on our agenda, consideration of a Commission public comment on the Department of Housing and Urban Development's proposed rule regarding the disparate impact standard under the Fair Housing Act.

While our typical practice is to read out the full statements under consideration by the Commission so we know what we're voting on, given the length of this proposed comment, I will summarize the main points, unless someone would

like for me to read the whole draft.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

So the main points are that HUD has proposed a new rule regarding the disparate impact standards used under the Fair Housing Act which respondent opposes. Discrimination in housing continues to be a pervasive problem throughout the United States.

Though the Fair Housing Act prohibited intentional housing discrimination in 1968, Commission and our advisory committees reported that substantial impediments to fair Disparate income liability housing persists today. under the Fair Housing Act is established in the law. The current standard used to evaluate disparate impact claims under the Fair Housing Act applied by the Courts of Appeals was codified in HUD's current rule and upheld by the Supreme Court Inclusive Communities four in the years ago decision.

The proposed rule is unnecessary and fails to advance the purpose of the Fair Housing Act. The proposed rule represents a departure from the current rule by increasing the burden for plaintiffs in disparate impact actions. The proposed rule replaces the established burden shift

impact with a substantial up-front prima facie requirement for plaintiffs and adds several new defenses against liability. We urge HUD to retain the current standard used and not to adopt the proposed rule.

To open the floor for discussion, I move to approve the comment as circulated by my special assistant yesterday evening. Is there a second?

COMMISSIONER KLADNEY: Kladney. I'll second.

CHAIR LHAMON: Thank you. I'll open the floor for discussion. Hearing none, I'll call the question and take a roll call vote.

COMMISSIONER NARASAKI: Madam Chair, this is Commissioner Narasaki. I just want to heartily support this statement. Disparate impact has existed in the law for a very long time. incredibly important, given the fact that, in many discrimination has sort of moved below cases, people becoming sophisticated with that they shouldn't actually state knowing their intentions might be or when there is actual just lack of understanding about how actions are disproportionately discriminating against

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

vulnerable communities.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

So I think it's, I think the HUD direction is incredibly dangerous and a disservice to fairness for vulnerable communities and I am glad that we are issuing this.

CHAIR LHAMON: Commissioner Narasaki, I wholeheartedly agree with you, but I think, among proud moments for this Commission was the the Commission's prescient call for use of disparate impact analysis when the Commission, specifically with generating all the reasons for the 1964 Civil Rights Act. that And I am pleased that persisted and persists in the Title VI Legal Manual for the Department of Justice and has persisted in the Fair Housing Act and in its analysis. was delighted that the Supreme Court recognized the importance of the use of that standard because of kind of forms of discrimination that the t.hat. analysis allows the department and the nation to see and to correct.

So I very strongly believe that the strong use of this standard is important for eradicating discrimination which our federal civil rights laws is designed to correct, and I hope very much that HUD course corrects and does not move

1	forward with its proposed rule.
2	Any further discussion? Hearing none,
3	I'll call the question and take a roll call vote.
4	Mr. Adegbile, how do you vote?
5	COMMISSIONER ADEGBILE: Recused.
6	CHAIR LHAMON: Commissioner Heriot.
7	COMMISSIONER HERIOT: I vote no.
8	CHAIR LHAMON: Commissioner Kirsanow.
9	COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: No.
10	CHAIR LHAMON: Commissioner Kladney.
11	COMMISSIONER KLADNEY: Yes.
12	CHAIR LHAMON: Commissioner Narasaki.
13	COMMISSIONER NARASAKI: Yes.
14	CHAIR LHAMON: Commissioner Yaki.
15	COMMISSIONER YAKI: Aye.
16	CHAIR LHAMON: Vice Chair Timmons-
17	Goodson.
18	VICE CHAIR TIMMONS-GOODSON: Yes.
19	CHAIR LHAMON: And I vote yes. The
20	motion passes. One commissioner was recused, two
21	commissioners oppose, all others were in favor.
22	MANAGEMENT AND OPERATIONS - STAFF DIRECTOR'S REPORT
23	CHAIR LHAMON: Next, we'll hear from
24	Staff Director Mauro Morales for the monthly Staff
25	Director's report.

1	MR. MORALES: Thank you, Madam Chair.
2	I have nothing further. In the interest of time, I
3	have nothing further to add. It's already
4	contained in the report. As always, I'm available
5	to discuss any particular matter that commissioners
6	or a commissioner may have about a particular issue
7	in the report. But thank you and I appreciate the
8	opportunity to talk.
9	CHAIR LHAMON: Thank you, Mr. Staff
10	Director. That concludes the business for our
11	meeting today. If there's nothing further, I
12	COMMISSIONER NARASAKI: Madam Chair,
13	before we adjourn, this just happened yesterday so
14	we didn't really have an opportunity to do
15	something formal, but I would like to note the sad
16	passing of Congressman Elijah Cummings who has long
17	been a leader on civil rights. And I hope that, at
18	an appropriate time, we can issue a more formal
19	statement on that.
20	III. ADJOURN MEETING
21	CHAIR LHAMON: Thank you, Commissioner
22	Narasaki. And if there is nothing further, I
23	hereby adjourn our meeting at 10:54 a.m. Eastern
24	Time. Thank you all.

(Whereupon, the above-entitled matter

went off the record at 10:54 a.m.)

2